

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 are amended, and claim 4 is canceled. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, an Information Disclosure Statement is being filed concurrently with this Amendment. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the cited references and initial the attached Form 1449 in the response.

**I. Claims 1-3 Define Patentable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohrl (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,776), in view of Spahn (U.S. Patent No. 5,469,727), and further in view of Weiss (U.S. Patent No. 6,794,988). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In particular, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Rohrl, Spahn nor Weiss either individually or in combination, disclose or suggest a locking system that uses IC tags to monitor access to game machines, and transmits the resulting history data to an outside resource, wherein the history data includes at least one of a key insertion time, a key withdrawal time, and a key ID abnormal time, as recited in independent claim 1.

Rohrl discloses a motor vehicle lock incorporating an interrogation/response dialog system. According to the disclosure of Rohrl, the time period between the emission of an interrogation signal and reception of response signal is measured such that a portable unit (such as an access card) outside the desired vicinity of a base unit cannot cause the motor vehicle to authorize the vehicle's operation. Thus, Rohrl simply discloses a polling system whereby the response time of a reflected signal is used to determine the distance between the unit transmitting the interrogation signal and the unit transmitting the response signal. Rohrl does not suggest using an IC tag for monitoring the opening and closing of game machines,

and transmitting the results of the monitoring (such as key insertion time, key withdrawal time, and key ID abnormal time) to an outside unit, as recited in independent claim 1.

Spahn and Weiss fail to overcome the deficiencies of Rohrl. Specifically, Spahn does not disclose the use of IC tags to monitor access to game machines and transmitting the results of the monitoring to an outside unit. Rather, Spahn simply discloses an electronic control circuit connected to a coupling coil in a key shank. See Spahn col. 5 ln. 39. According to Spahn, the coupling coil can be inductively coupled with another coupling coil provided in a lock cylinder when the key is inserted, enabling transmission of coding information between the electronic control circuits. See fig 4. Thus, under Spahn, the electronic circuits need to be electronically connected to transmit information, and cannot communicate via RF. Therefore, Spahn fails to disclose the use of IC tags to monitor locking, or the transmission of information regarding the locking operation (such as key insertion time, key withdrawal time, and key ID abnormal time) to an outside unit, as recited independent claim 1.

Similarly, Weiss fails to overcome the deficiencies of Rohrl and Spahn. Specifically, Weiss does not disclose or suggest a locking system that uses IC tags to monitor locking and transmitting the resulting history data to an outside resource. Weiss simply discloses a motor vehicle lock whereby a signal detector stored in the lock cylinder forwards key signals to an evaluating unit for comparison. See Weiss col. 3 Ins. 59-64. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the forwarding of key signals for comparison, as disclosed in Weiss, does not correspond to the transmission of history data to an outside unit, as recited independent claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant asserts that independent claim 1 is allowable. The Applicant also asserts that claims 2 and 3 are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable base claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-3 be withdrawn.

**II. Claim 8 Defines Patentable Subject Matter**

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohrl, in view of Spahn and Weiss. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In particular, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Rohrl, Spahn nor Weiss either individually or in combination, disclose or suggest a locking system for a game machine that uses IC tags to monitor access to game machines having an output means for outputting the result of a determination means to the outside, as recited in independent claim 8.

As discussed above, Rohrl simply discloses a polling system whereby the response time of a reflected signal is used to determine the distance between the unit transmitting the interrogation signal and the unit transmitting the response signal. Rohrl does not suggest using an IC tag for monitoring the opening and closing of game machines, and transmitting the result of a determination means to the outside, as recited in independent claim 8.

Spahn and Weiss fail to overcome the deficiencies of Rohrl. As discussed above, Spahn simply discloses inductively coupled coils provided in a lock cylinder in such manner to enable transmission of coding information between the electronic control circuits. Similarly, Weiss simply discloses a motor vehicle lock whereby a signal detector stored in the lock cylinder forwards key signals to an evaluating unit for comparison. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that neither Spahn nor Weiss, disclose or suggest using an IC tag for monitoring the opening and closing of game machines and transmitting the result of a determination means to the outside, as recited in independent claim 8.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

**III. Claim 5 Defines Patentable Subject Matter**

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohrl, in view of Spahn, Weiss, Ohnishi (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,255), Ford (U.S. Patent No. 6,681,987), and Kennedy (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,291). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, neither Rohrl, Spahn nor Weiss, either individually or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1. Ohnishi, Ford and Kennedy fail to overcome the deficiencies of Rohrl, Spahn and Weiss.

In particular, Ohnishi simply discloses a vehicle lock consisting of a key, a key cylinder, and a wireless antenna mounted at a predetermined position in a vehicle. The key is used to transmit a wireless signal to the wireless antenna, instructing the vehicle to lock its doors. However, to minimize interference, and when the key is inserted in the key cylinder, a control IC located on the key inhibits the transmission of the wireless signal while initiating communicating with the key cylinder. The key cylinder then uses an ID code to authenticate the key such that the vehicle is immobilized if the key is not recognized. Thus, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the transmission of a wireless signal, as disclosed in Ohnishi, does not correspond to the transmission of history data (such as key insertion time, key withdrawal time, and key ID abnormal time) to an outside unit, as recited independent claim 1.

Ford fails to overcome the aforementioned deficiencies. Ford discloses an on-board communication system for regulating the use of vehicles, whereby a smart card containing identifying information unique to a driver communicates electronically with an engine control unit mounted in the driver's vehicle. An engine control unit then stores the vehicle's operation history with respect to the individual driver, and in the event the driver violates a preset condition, the engine control unit prevents the driver for starting the vehicle. Thus, the communication between the smart card and the vehicle disclosed in Ford does not correspond

to the transmission of history data (such as key insertion time, key withdrawal time, and key ID abnormal time) to an outside unit, as recited independent claim 1.

Kennedy also fails to overcome the deficiencies discussed above. In particular, Kennedy discloses a key-in-ignition lock system, incorporated into a vehicle having an anti-theft system, whereby a driver is able to determine whether a vehicle's failure to start is due to the activation of the anti-theft system, or an engine malfunction. Specifically, Kennedy discloses sounding a key chime whenever a key having a proper identification code is inserted into the ignition, such that the driver knows when the anti-theft system is the reason for the vehicle's failure to start. However, Kennedy does not disclose or suggest the transmission of history data (such as key insertion time, key withdrawal time, and key ID abnormal time) to an outside unit, as recited independent claim 1.

Therefore, in light of the foregoing arguments, Applicant asserts that claim 5 is allowable, at least for its dependence on claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

**IV. Claim 6 Defines Patentable Subject Matter**

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohrl, in view of Spahn, Weiss, Ohnishi and Ford. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, neither Rohrl, Spahn, Weiss, Ohnishi or Ford, either individually or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that claim 6 is allowable, at least for its dependence on claim 1, and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

**V. Claim 7 Defines Patentable Subject Matter**

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohrl, in view of Spahn, Weiss, Ohnishi, and Ford, and further in view of Vanderschel (U.S. Patent No. 5,349,345). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, neither Rohrl, Spahn, Weiss, Ohnishi, or Ford, either individually or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1. Vanderschel fails to overcome the deficiencies of Rohrl, Spahn, Weiss, Ohnishi, and Ford. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

**VI. Claim 9 Defines Patentable Subject Matter**

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohrl, in view of Spahn and Weiss, and further in view of Luciano (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,969). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, neither Rohrl, Spahn, or Weiss, either individually or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1. Luciano fails to overcome the deficiencies of Rohrl, Spahn, and Weiss. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

**VII. Claims 10-12 Define Patentable Subject Matter**

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohrl, in view of Spahn and Weiss, and further in view of Borugian (U.S. Patent No. 5,718,235). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, neither Rohrl, Spahn, or Weiss, either individually or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1. Borugian fails to overcome the deficiencies of Rohrl, Spahn, and Weiss. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 10-12 be withdrawn.

**VIII. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Benjamin B. Mazahery  
Registration No. 60,969

JAO:BBM/lmf

Attachment:

Information Disclosure Statement

Date: November 6, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---